

United States Patent and Trademark Office



APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/980,375	11/29/2001	Ze'ev Ganor	013/02472	1331
7	590 01/21/2003			·
William H Dippert			EXAMINER	
Cowan Liebowitz & Latman 1133 Avenue of the Americas			BUDD, MARK OSBORNE	
New York, NY 10036-6799			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2834	

DATE MAILED: 01/21/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

/ 3
·



Applicant(s)

Application No. 980 375 Ganor Office Action Summary Examiner Group Art Unit

	M. 15000 +834
-The MAILING DATE of this communication appears	on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—
eriod for Reply	i e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e
eriod for Reply SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO F THIS COMMUNICATION.	EXPIRE MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE
from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a re If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state	.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS ply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. ute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). ing date of this communication, even if timely, may reduce any earned patent
catus the 3 d	A1 :
Responsive to communication(s) filed on $\frac{11-\chi q}{}$	
☐ This action is FINAL.	
☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935	for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in C.D. 1 1; 453 O.G. 213.
isposition of Claims	
(Claim(s) 1-4, 6, 7 and 10-59	is/are pending in the application.
	is/are withdrawn from consideration.
□ Claim(s)	
□ Claim(s)	is/are rejected.
☐ Claim(s)	is/are objected to.
Colaim(s) 1-4, 6, 7 and 10-54	is/are objected to. are subject to restriction or election requirement
pplication Papers ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	·
☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are object	ted to by the Examiner
☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.	
☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.	
riority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)–(d)	
☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority to	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)–(d).
□ All □ Some* □ None of the:	
☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been r	eceived.
☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been r	
☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority document	
in this national stage application from the International	l Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))
*Certified copies not received:	·
ittachment(s)	
\tachment(s) □ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No.	o(s) Interview Summary, PTO-413
Attachment(s) Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No. Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892	o(s) □ Interview Summary, PTO-413 □ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-15



Art Unit: 2834

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 10-31 and 43-54, drawn to a piezo electric motor, classified in class 310, subclass 323.02.
- II. Claims 32-42, drawn to a method of driving a micro motor, classified in class 310, subclass 317.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because:

Inventions Group I and Group II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the piezo electric motor can be operated without variation of the rise and fall times. Also, the method steps of Group II could be used with non piezo electric motors, e.g. magnitostrictive plates could be substituted for the piezoelectric elements.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Application/Control Number: 09/980,375

Page 3

Budd/ek

Art Unit: 2834

01/16/03

WHATE J. BUDD PRIMARY EXAMINER ART UNIT 212